



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/797,202	03/09/2004	Paul Janke	B-4127NP 621599-6	4097

7590 12/14/2005
Richard P. Berg, ESQ.
c/o LADAS & PARRY
Suite 2100
5670 Wilshire Boulevard
Los Angeles, CA 90036-5679

EXAMINER

LINDSAY JR, WALTER LEE

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2812

DATE MAILED: 12/14/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/797,202	Applicant(s) JANKE, PAUL	
	Examiner Walter L. Lindsay, Jr.	Art Unit 2812	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-34 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 12-23 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8, 10, 11, 24-30, 33 and 34 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 9, 31, 32 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____. |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____. | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: ____. |

DETAILED ACTION

This Office Action is in response to an Amendment filed 9/27/2005.

Currently, claims 1-32 are pending.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

2. Claims 1-5, 8, 10-11 and 24-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Lai et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,766,967 dated 6/16/1998).

Lai show the method as claimed in Figs. 3A.-3F and corresponding text as: providing a substrate (52); depositing at least a first (54), a second (56) and a third (58) electron sensitive resist layers (photoresist layers) over the substrate, the first electron sensitive resist layer being disposed closer to said substrate than are said second and third electron sensitive resist layers, the second electron sensitive resist layer being disposed closer to said substrate than is said third electron sensitive resist layer (col. 3, lines 35-56); forming a mold in at least the first, second and third electron sensitive resist layers (col. 3, lines 35-56); and evaporating the refractory metal (Ti/Pt/Au Titanium is a refractory metal that is include in this alloy) in the mold, wherein at least the first and third electron sensitive resist layers in the plurality of electron sensitive resist layers maintain their shape during the step of evaporating the refractory metal in the mold (col. 4, lines 33-44) (claim 1). Lai teaches that the forming of mold includes

exposing the first, second and third electron sensitive resist layers to an electron beam, thereby defining exposed regions in the first second and third electron sensitive resist layers (col. 3, lines 35-56) (claim 2). Lai teaches developing the exposed regions in the first, second and third electron sensitive resist layers, thereby removing the exposed regions from the first, second and third electron sensitive resist layers and thereby creating the mold (col. 3, lines 35-56) (claim 3). Lai teaches that the first and third electron sensitive resist layers are less sensitive to the electron beam than is the second electron sensitive resist layer (col. 3, line 57- col. 4, line 24) (claim 4). Lai teaches that the middle electron sensitive layer has a viscosity that allows the second electron sensitive resist layer to be at least 7000Å thick (Corresponds to electrode size) (col. 4, lines 33-44) (claim 5). Lai teaches that the electrode is a gate electrode (col. 4, lines 45-47) (claim 8). Lai teaches that the mold defines a mushroom shape (col. 3, lines 35-56) (claim 10). Lai teaches the step of lifting off the plurality of electron sensitive resist layers after the step of depositing the gate contact (col. 4, lines 33-44) (claim 11). Lai show the method as claimed in Figs. 3A-3F and corresponding text as: providing a substrate (52); depositing a plurality of electron sensitive resist layers on the substrate, the plurality of electron sensitive resist layers comprising an electron sensitive resist layer nearest the substrate (54), an electron sensitive resist layer farthest from the substrate (58), and a intermediate electron sensitive resist layer formed between the electron sensitive resist layer nearest the substrate and the electron sensitive resist layer farthest from the substrate (56); forming a mold in at least the intermediate electron sensitive resist layer and in at least the electron sensitive

Art Unit: 2812

resist layer nearest the substrate, the mold defining a mushroom shape (col. 3, lines 35-56); and evaporating the refractory metal in the mold, wherein the electron sensitive resist layer nearest the substrate and the electron sensitive resist layer farthest from the substrate maintain their shape during the evaporation of the refractory metal (col. 4, lines 33-44)(claim 24). Lai teaches the formation of the mold includes exposing the plurality of electron sensitive resist layers to an electron beam, thereby defining exposed regions in the plurality of electron sensitive resist layers (col. 3, lines 35-56) (claim 25). Lai teaches developing the exposed regions in the plurality of electron sensitive resist layers, thereby removing the exposed regions from the plurality of electron sensitive resist layers and thereby creating the mold (col. 3, lines 35-56) (claim 26). Lai teaches that the electron sensitive resist layer in the two electron sensitive resist layers nearest the substrate is less sensitive to the electron beam than the intermediate electron sensitive resist layer (col. 3, line 57-col. 4, line 24) (claim 27). Lai teaches that the intermediate electron sensitive resist layer has a viscosity which allows the intermediate electron sensitive resist layer to be at least 7000Å thick (col. 4, lines 33-44) (claim 28).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 2812

4. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

5. Claims 6-7 and 29-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lai et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,766,967 dated 6/16/1998) in view of Minter et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,255,035 dated 7/3/2001).

Lai shows the method substantially as claimed and described in the preceding paragraphs.

Lai lacks the anticipation only in not explicitly teaching that: 1) the refractory metal is selected from a member of the group consisting of tungsten and molybdenum (claims 6 and 29); 2) the plurality of electron sensitive resist layers are exposed to temperatures up to approximately 180°C during the evaporation of the refractory metal (claims 7 and 30) and 3) the at least first and third electron sensitive resist layers maintain their shape during the step of evaporating the refractory metal in the mold when exposed to temperatures up to 180°C (claims 33 and 34).

Minter shows a method of forming a metal T-Gates for high-speed semiconductor devices. In the formation of the T- gate (mushroom shape) metal contact, on suitable metal is tungsten is done by evaporation (col. 10, lines 1-24). A photoresist is also exposed to a temperature of approximately 180°C (col. 10, lines 27-33). The gate

Art Unit: 2812

structure provides a solution for the problems that arise during processing by maintaining control of photoresist image shapes while maximizing yield (col. 3, line 56-col. 4, line 6).

It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to modify the method of Lai, by selecting a refractory metal from the group of tungsten and molybdenum and exposing the electron sensitive resist layers to temperatures up to approximately 180°C, as taught by Minter, with the motivation that Minter teaches a solution for the problems that arise during processing by maintaining control of photoresist image shapes while maximizing yield.

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments filed 9/27/2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. In reference to the usage of titanium as a refractory metal, the examiner would like to point to page 384 of Silicon Processing for the VLSI ERA, as support for the inclusion of titanium in the group of Refractory metals. In reference to the use of Lai, claim 1 only discusses the step of evaporation not what happens after evaporation takes place to the surrounding structure that is intact during the process. The examiner would also like to point out that it would be obvious for a photoresist that is soft baked to 170°C to maintain its shape at temperatures approximately at 180°C during the evaporation of metals and would do so without the need for undue experimentation.

Allowable Subject Matter

7. Claims 9, 31 and 32 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

8. Claims 12-23 are allowed.

9. The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter: the prior art, either singly or in combination fails to anticipate or render obvious, the limitations of:

...further comprising depositing a high electrical conductivity metal gate contact over the refractory metal, thereby forming the gate electrode, as required by claim 9, as it depends from claim 1;

...further comprising depositing a gate contact over refractory metal, thereby forming a gate, as required by claim 31, as it depends from claim 24; and

...depositing a first, a second and a third electron sensitive resist layer over the substrate and the alignment markers;

removing the portions of the plurality of electron sensitive resist layers above and around the alignment markers;

forming a mold in plurality of electron sensitive resist layers using the alignment markers as reference points; and

Art Unit: 2812

evaporating the refractory metal in the mold, the first and third electron sensitive resist maintaining their respective shapes during evaporation of the refractory metal, as is required by claim 12.

Conclusion

10. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Walter L. Lindsay, Jr. whose telephone number is (571) 272-1674. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael S. Lebentritt can be reached on (571) 272-1873. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2812

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Walter L. Lindsay, Jr.
Examiner
Art Unit 2812

WLL

December 6, 2005